PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

PCT

NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL OF COPIES OF TRANSLATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Rule 72.2)

To:

OTTE, Peter
Otte & Jakelski
Mollenbachstrasse 37
D-71229 Leonberg
ALLEMAGNE

Date of mailing (day/month/year) 22 August 2001 (22.08.01)	
Applicant's or agent's file reference 20041PCT	**IMPORTANT NOTIFICATION**
International application No. PCT/IB99/01560	**International filing date** (day/month/year) 27 August 1999 (27.08.99)
Applicant VOGT, Werner	

1. Transmittal of the translation to the applicant.

The International Bureau transmits herewith a copy of the English translation made by the International Bureau of the international preliminary examination report established by the International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. Transmittal of the copy of the translation to the elected Offices.

The International Bureau notifies the applicant that copies of that translation have been transmitted to the following elected Offices requiring such translation:

JP,US

The following elected Offices, having waived the requirement for such a transmittal at this time, will receive copies of that translation from the International Bureau only upon their request:

EP

3. Reminder regarding translation into (one of) the official language(s) of the elected Office(s).

The applicant is reminded that, where a translation of the international application must be furnished to an elected Office, that translation must contain a translation of any annexes to the international preliminary examination report.

It is the applicant's responsibility to prepare and furnish such translation directly to each elected Office concerned (Rule 74.1). See Volume II of the PCT Applicant's Guide for further details.

The International Bureau of WIPO
34, chemin des Colombettes
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Facsimile No. (41-22) 740.14.35

Authorized officer

CRUZ Juan

Telephone No. (41-22) 338.83.38

Translation

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 20041PCT	**FOR FURTHER ACTION** See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
International application No. PCT/IB99/01560	International filing date (*day/month/year*) 27 August 1999 (27.08.99)	Priority date (*day/month/year*) 29 August 1998 (29.08.98)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC B32B 31/20, B42D 15/10		
Applicant VOGT, Werner		

1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.

☐ This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).

These annexes consist of a total of _____ sheets.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the report
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☒ Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand	Date of completion of this report
21 March 2000 (21.03.00)	31 October 2000 (31.10.2000)
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/EP Facsimile No.	Authorized officer Telephone No.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.
PCT/IB99/01560

I. Basis of the report

1. This report has been drawn on the basis of (*Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to the report since they do not contain amendments.*):

☐ the international application as originally filed.

☒ the description, pages 1-11, as originally filed,
pages _____, filed with the demand,
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____,
pages _____, filed with the letter of _____.

☒ the claims, Nos. 1-11, as originally filed,
Nos. _____, as amended under Article 19,
Nos. _____, filed with the demand,
Nos. _____, filed with the letter of _____,
Nos. _____, filed with the letter of _____.

☒ the drawings, sheets/fig 1/1, as originally filed,
sheets/fig _____, filed with the demand,
sheets/fig _____, filed with the letter of _____,
sheets/fig _____, filed with the letter of _____.

2. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☐ the description, pages _____
☐ the claims, Nos. _____
☐ the drawings, sheets/fig _____

3. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-11	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-11	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-11	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

1. Document DE-92 18 986 is considered the prior art closest to the subject matter of Claim 1 and discloses (the references between parentheses are to that document):

a method for producing an information or data-bearing card, in which a surface of a card-size region of a blank material is covered with a (transparent protective) layer (Claim 1). The layer is pressed onto the surface of the card while being subjected to heat and pressure simultaneously (Claim 6). One area of the layer can be cooled after having been subjected to heat (Claim 8). Pressure is generated by means of an eccentric (Claim 2), an electromotor (Claim 3) or a prestressed spring (Claim 4). In order to receive and position a card to be laminated, the laminator comprises a base plate, a passepartout-like (fit part out - like) frame that can be set on the base plate for framing or receiving the card to be laminated and a top plate that can be set on the card in the frame (Claim 10). The surfaces facing the card are high-polished metal surfaces (Claim 11) and can be at least partially coated or coated in some partial areas (Claim 12). The peripheral width

of the frame corresponds to the usual clipping produced when a (net) card is cut out of a blank material (Claim 14).

The subject matter of Claim 1 therefore differs from that known method in that quantities of heat which would normally escape over the narrow peripheral regions of the material introduced are retained therein, stored and reflected or refocused onto the laminate mould.

The subject matter of Claim 1 is therefore novel (PCT Article 33(2)).

2. The present invention can therefore be considered to address the problem of devising a lamination method in which the introduced material to be laminated is uniformly subjected to heat, including in particular the peripheral regions (page 4, paragraph 3).

The solution to this problem, as proposed in Claim 1 of the present application, does not involve an inventive step (PCT Article 33(3)) for the following reasons:

As mentioned in the present application, problems arise in standard lamination methods because of heat losses in the peripheral region of the plates to be laminated. The present application can therefore be considered to address the problem of avoiding heat losses in the peripheral region of the plates to be laminated.

The solution proposed represents only a reformulation of this problem in the form of the

result to be achieved: "the quantities of heat which would normally escape over the narrow peripheral region of the material introduced are retained therein, stored, reflected or refocused onto the laminate mould", instead of indicating the technical features or method steps required to achieve the desired result.

In addition, the solution proposed represents the most obvious desired result which a person skilled in the art seeking to solve the above problem would try to achieve. The minor structural modification of the laminator used is straightforward to a person skilled in the art, especially since only the results to be achieved are claimed and its advantages are easily foreseeable.

Moreover, D1 already indicates in general terms the possibility to coat the high-polished metal surfaces (Claim 12). Consequently, a person skilled in the art would consider most obvious the step of providing the metal surfaces of the frame with a heat-reflecting coating, for example, in order to reduce unwanted heat losses.

3. D1 also represents the prior art closest to the subject matter of the present Claim 2. Accordingly, an argument analogous to the argument put forward with regard to the method claim above could also be applied to the device Claim 2.

The distinguishing feature of Claim 2 in relation to D2 is also the indication of the desired properties of the frame material ("has a frame made of a material which does not conduct or hardly conducts

heat, which reflects or refocuses heat onto the laminate introduced). The device described in Claim 2 therefore also fails to involve an inventive step, for the same reasons as indicated above for Claim 1.

4. Dependent Claims 3-11 do not appear to contain any further features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, could make a significant contribution to inventive step. The features indicated are either known from the prior art (see point 1 and D1, Fig. 5) or are straightforward to a person skilled in the art, on the basis of familiar considerations, especially since the advantages achieved thereby are easily foreseeable and the present application does not demonstrate any surprising advantages or unexpected effects which could be attributed to these features.

VIII. Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

1. Claims 1 and 2 do not meet the requirements of PCT Article 6 because the subject matter for which protection is sought is not clearly defined. These claims attempt to define their subject matter in terms of the result to be achieved, and in doing so merely state the problem addressed. In order to eliminate this defect, it appears necessary to include in the claims the technical features required to achieve this result.

2. The expressions "narrow, minor" used in Claims 1 and 2 are vague and unclear and leave the reader uncertain about the meaning of the technical features in question. As a result, the definition of the subject matter of these claims is not clear (PCT Article 6).